



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,682	01/28/2004	Carl Cetera	SS-29'	5574

7590

06/07/2005

Mark D. Nielsen  
The Soni Law Firm  
Suite 720  
55 S. Lake Ave.  
Pasadena, CA 91101

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TUAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3751

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/767,682

Applicant(s)

CETERA, CARL

Examiner

Tuan N. Nguyen

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2005 and 06 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/6/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Krause reference is being considered for the structure as claimed, which is capable of performing the function as claimed. The design appearance and the toughness of the material of the Krause device have no bearing on the structure being claimed in the instant application. The functional language of "a large volume of, or thick, material" has no bearing on the structure since no specific dimension was given and that the thickness of an object would depend on a user/person point of view.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krause.

In regard to claims 1-6 and 8-11, Krause discloses a hand-held implement for writing or marking comprising a body (11', 15'), including body flanges (19') (see Fig. 7) displaced radially outward from the outermost surface of the body (11', 15'); a writing or marking instrument included in the body; a clip assembly (see Fig. 5) is considered as permanently attached to the body of the hand-held implement once assembled thereto and has a rigid member (16) for securably claspings a large volume of, or thick, material

Art Unit: 3751

between the body and the rigid member without deformation or breaking of the rigid member, the rigid member has a first end (about the ball) where material is held against the body and a second end for manually pivoting the rigid member away from the body, and a helical coil spring (20) biasing the first end of the rigid member towards the body, the spring being sufficiently strong to grasp a large volume of, or thick, material between the first end of the rigid member and the body; and a guide pin (18') securing the clip assembly to the body flanges. The guide pin is elevated relative to the body (11', 15'). The body flanges (19') include one or more holes that receive the guide pin (18') (see Fig. 7). The rigid member contains at least one flange (17), which includes a hole that receives the guide pin (see Fig. 7). The rigid member comprises a protrusion on the inner surface of the rigid member in proximity to the first end of said rigid member formed by the ball (see Fig. 5) and in contact with the body when the clip assembly is at rest.

The first end of said rigid member is inherently capable of having a maximum angular displacement of approximately 35 degrees relative to the body depending on the user.

Claims 14-18 and 20-22 are broader versions or similar to claims 1-6 and 8-11, which have been addressed above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3751

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12, 13, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause in view of Kehr.

Although the Krause reference is silent of advertising is depicted on the surface of the rigid member, attention is directed to the Kehr reference which discloses a similar clip assembly having advertising is depicted on the surface of a rigid member (see Fig. 7), said advertising being viewable when the hand-held implement for writing or marking is within the user's garment pocket, is clasped to an anchoring point, or in the user's hand. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ, on the Krause rigid member (16), advertising as, for example, taught by Kehr so as to provide a more attractive appearance.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Double Patenting***

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-6 and 8-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,685,374 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the languages in the independent claims 1 and 14 of the instant application are nearly identical minus the limitation of the guide pin comprises of a tapered cylindrical element with a slit along its longitudinal axis. Furthermore, the limitation of "tapered cylindrical element with a slit along its longitudinal axis" is further being claimed in claim 19. Even if the applicant takes away that limitation, the applicant is still not allow to contend for a broader coverage since the applicant fails to contend for the broader coverage in the parent application. The applicant would allow a separate patent only if the claim of the instant application is claiming other limitation structure(s), which was not claimed in the parent application.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not


Art Unit: 3751

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (10:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine R. Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Tuan Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3751  
6/3/05

TN